

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/715,118	SHIBAYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEVEN H. RAO	2814	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) STEVEN H. RAO. (3)_____

(2) Joseph J. Buczyzynski (35,084). (4)_____

Date of Interview: 08 January 2010.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1,3-16 and 26-28.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bauer, Chappo & Yamanaka.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Steven H Rao/
Examiner, Art Unit 2814

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: AR Buczynski called Ex. Rao and stated he will fax proposed amendment. A proposed response was faxed on 01/06/09. AR Buczynski and Ex. Rao spoke on Friday 01/08/10, wherein Ex. Rao stated that Applicants' have to amend their present claims to see what can be allowable. It is noted that the outstanding rejection was result of a Pre Appeal brief review cnference wherein two SPES agreed with the outstanding rejection. Ex. Rao requested presentation of claims that were allowable or amendments that moved the prosecution along..